



**U.S. Department of Commerce**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**  
**Assistant Commissioner of Patents**  
**Technology Center 3600**  
**2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA**

**FAX COVER SHEET**

To: MR. STEVE SOLOMON From: EXAMINER: YOGESH GARG  
Fax: 216-579-6073 Art Unit: 3625  
Serial No.: 09/055062 Date: 01/15/2003  
CC: Phone No.: 703-306-0252

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☐ Per Your Request

A COPY OF OFFICE ACTION, PAPER # 13 WITH A COPY  
OF - REFERENCE USED TO REJECT CLAIMS 1 & 2.  
• Comments: ENCLOSED

Number of Pages 25, including this page.

**STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

This facsimile transmission is an official U.S. Government document that may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

01/15/03  
informed Mr. Solomon - Fax sent

1. The reasons for allowance is not clear. The concluding part of the reasons (beginning with "therefore" on the next to last line) merely repeats the claim. The specific limitations which impart patentability need to be pointed out. This is particularly true where the interview summary record fails to specify any agreed upon language or any limitations which might impart patentability, in conjunction with the fact that applicant's remarks in the ensuing amendment provide no explanation of the interview or any discussion about why the claims as amended define over the rejection.

3. Note that the Search Query is not annotated.

4. The file is missing the US references to Mahoney and Green.

5. At least claim 1 does not appear to be allowable over old practices in web real estate sales. Claim 1 seems to only require:

- providing a sign
- providing a website
- the seller placing the sign with an ID in his yard
- the seller being given an ID when he logs on or the seller using the ID to input information at the web site.

These limitation appear to be met by the procedures provided on the FSBO Advertising web site found on the wayback machine from Mar 2, 2000 and June 21, 2000. This website allows a seller to place an ad on the internet and purchase a sign with a blank spot for an identifying number, the "Ad#". The seller can update his information on the web for the Ad#. Claim 1 seems to require no more.